

FEB 18 1959

## 'Bipartisan' Turmoil

# Dulles' Illness, Fulbright's Rise May Give Democrats Bigger Say in Foreign Policy

By ROBERT D. NOVAK

WASHINGTON—Secretary of State Dulles' illness makes serious turmoil almost certain in the "bipartisanship" of U.S. foreign policy.

Even before the Secretary was stricken, the foreign affairs relationship between the Democratic-controlled Senate and the Administration faced change, with the rise of the highly-critical Senator Fulbright to the Foreign Relations Committee chairmanship. With the stubborn, durable but respected Mr. Dulles on the job, however, Mr. Fulbright would have faced tough going in his desire to shape a basically "new" foreign policy of accommodation with Russia, rather than preservation of peace in a state of cold war.

But with Mr. Dulles at least temporarily out of the picture, it remains to be seen how well the State Department now will be able to resist Mr. Fulbright's attempts to give his Senate committee a more "creative" role in making foreign policy. That the Democratic aggressiveness is not limited to Mr. Fulbright was underlined by the speech the other day by Senator Mansfield, who went much farther in proposing concessions to the Soviets on Germany than has anyone in the State Department.

That there would be a State Department-Senate struggle seemed apparent when Rhode Island's 91-year-old Senator Green stepped down as Foreign Relations Committee chairman, to be replaced by highly intellectual, former Rhodes Scholar, Fulbright. Certainly a more vigorous approach could be expected from the 54-year-old Arkansan than from the oldest man ever to serve in the Senate.

It was also apparent that sterner monitoring of State Department actions could be expected from the committee because Mr. Fulbright has had few kind words and many harsh ones for Secretary of State Dulles during the past six years. His criticism has ranged from a general charge of "inflexibility" to questioning specific decisions such as landing troops in Lebanon last year. The actions of whomever succeeds Mr. Dulles, in fact if not in form, will continue to come under the scrutiny of Mr. Fulbright's critical eye.

### Signs of Strain

Manifestations of Mr. Fulbright's new prominence began to appear even before the Arkansan officially assumed his chairmanship. He was invited to Mr. Dulles' home for unusual discussion just before the Secretary's latest trip to Europe. A few days later, Senator Fulbright served notice that the committee would scrutinize more fully than ever before the qualifications of appointees to key diplomatic posts.

And the new climate in the Foreign Relations Committee goes beyond a younger hand at the helm. Whether Mr. Dulles is replaced or not, State Department policy-

makers will have to consider the far-ranging views of the stern-faced Southerner.

Senator Fulbright believes that aiming for "containment" of Soviet power within its present borders, a policy that has dominated State Department thinking under Mr. Dulles and under Democratic Secretary Acheson before him, is not enough by itself. He likewise considers shallow the emphasis placed by Missouri's Senator Symington and other Democrats on U.S. military power as the key to peace.

Instead, Mr. Fulbright wants to explore the possibility of an agreement between the two great powers based on mutual respect. This would necessitate at least modifying the old doctrines that Communist power in Russia eventually will topple and that the U.S. is correct morally at all times as the righteous antagonist in the cold war.

Translated into practical action, this could mean that the U.S. would consider proposals it has rejected out of hand in the past. Examples: Disengagement from the Soviets in central Europe to create a buffer zone, ultimate recognition of Communist China.

To even nudge the State Department toward such sweeping policy shifts, the Foreign Relations Committee would have to assume a more positive role than at any time in recent history. The Constitution vests the Senate with an interest in foreign affairs through the power to ratify treaties and to confirm appointments to key diplomatic posts. But this essentially is the negative power of the veto. Thus, it is no accident that the Senate's most remembered acts in foreign affairs have been negative ones such as the scuttling of the League of Nations Covenant. Even in the heyday of bipartisanship during the first Truman Administration, the power wielded by Republican Committee Chairman Vandenberg was primarily that of an informal veto.

Bipartisanship, in the eyes of some Democrats, has degenerated into a device used by the State Department to mute criticism from Capitol Hill by committing Senators in advance to foreign policy moves. It is identical to Republican complaints during the Truman regime.

Whether this view is valid or not, in any event, the Eisenhower Administration cannot count with certainty on Mr. Fulbright to emulate his Democratic predecessors—the late Senator George of Georgia and Senator Green—in winning formal Senate approval for foreign policy doctrines. Mr. George pushed the Eisenhower resolution pledging the defense of Formosa because he felt a split between Congress and the President would give aid and comfort to the enemy; Mr. Fulbright is a universe away from this type of thinking.

In his revised version of bipartisanship,

in more frequent meetings with State Department officials but not necessarily murmur from public criticism. The concern concerning the external of foreign policy may be lighter than many expect. Fulbright's goals as greater flexibility in policymaking are veering toward a heavier emphasis on economic rather than military aid. Muses one senior Democratic Senator: "Fulbright is taking over at the point in history when the State Department seems willing to change."

But the department holds a trump card in resisting the fullest implications of Senator's views: The American public tends to agree more with Mr. Dulles than with Mr. Fulbright in regarding the cold war as a battle of morality against immorality and distrusting the Soviets as evil incarnate. Appreciating the force of this opinion, Mr. Fulbright will devote much time in "educating" the American public to the facts of international life as he sees them.

In embarking on this campaign of persuasion, Senator Fulbright can expect little real assistance from the other Democratic members of the committee. Senators Humphrey of Minnesota and Kennedy of Massachusetts are too involved in the Presidential sweepstakes to put all their eggs in the foreign affairs basket; Senators Morse of Oregon and Lausche of Ohio are determined and rather unpredictable in individualism; Alabama's Senator Sparkman is spread thin as his party's Senate voice on housing and small business. Only Montana's Senator Mansfield has the time and inclination for real support.

This means that the job will fall largely on the new chairman, a man far from the stereotype of the American politician. An "egghead" who delights in the cultural pursuits and the world of ideas, Senator Fulbright is not overly beloved by his colleagues. His tone often is professorial, and he only thinly disguises his condescending air for Senators of frailer mental prowess.

Despite this aloofness, he has been remarkably effective in parliamentary fighting. As a House member, the one-time "boy" president of the University of Arkansas co-sponsored the original United Nations resolution. In the Senate he guided his Inter-National Student Exchange Program through to passage over stern opposition and was one of the principal behind-the-scenes engineers of the censure of the late Senator McCarthy of Wisconsin.

### His Real Interest

On occasion, Senator Fulbright has been accused of being a lazy legislator; and his appearance of giving but casual attention to the day-to-day business of the Senate Banking Committee during his years as chairman would seem to prove it. But the banking panel's investigations of the Reconstruction Finance Corp. and the stock market showed he could buckle down to sustained work when genuinely interested. And foreign policy always has been his genuine interest.

Senator Fulbright now is seeking out foreign policy experts of every shade and is studying the current disengagement theories of George Kennan, author of the containment policy while with the State Department. He has, however, no definite mentor; certainly he will not sit at the feet of Mr. Acheson, who is still considered by